UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/554,309	08/28/2006	Hans Gygax	30887/04002	2653
	7590 09/15/201 TER & GRISWOLD, I	EXAMINER		
800 SUPERIOR		O'HARA, BRIAN M		
SUITE 1400 CLEVELAND,	ОН 44114	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3644	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/15/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ipdocket@calfee.com dcunin@calfee.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/554,309	GYGAX, HANS		
Examiner	Art Unit		
BRIAN M. O'HARA	3644		

	BRIAN M. O'HARA	3644	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 29 August 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ring replies: (1) an amendment, affice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in a	idavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 Cl	ce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
 a)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth tter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (1) TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	06.07(f). On which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	36(a) and the appropria of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Offi	te extension fee ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the con	nsideration and/or search (see NO w); ter form for appeal by materially re	TE below);	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) rejected: 1 and 3-10.	lowable if submitted in a separate, will not be entered, or b) wi	timely filed amendme	nt canceling the
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe vand was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	ls to provide a).
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	k daaa NOT ulaaa kha ayuuliaakian i		
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	t does NOT place the application if	n condition for allowar	ice because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/B. M. O./ Examiner, Art Unit 3644	/JOSHUA J MICHENEF Primary Examiner, Art U		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: On page 6 line 10 through Page 7 Line 4 of the remarks filed 08/29/2011 applicant argues that the Firner reference does not disclose dimensions of the airplane cabin and therefore cannot anticipate an orthorhombic space for receiving a person lying on a stretcher. These arguments are not commensurate with the scope of the rejection which is an obviousness type rejection. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art could look at the figures of Firner and find it obvious that a person lying on a stretcher could fit within the cabin. On Page 7 lines 5-8, applicant argues that a stretcher could not fit because bars 20 and 21 would obstruct passage of the stretcher. A stretcher could fit next to or above bar 20. Both bars 20 and 21 sit relatively low in the cabin (See Fig. 1). Additionally, most the rear portion of the fuselage appears to be unfilled volume which could accommodate a person on a stretcher. On Page 7 Lines 9-14 applicant argues that placing a stretch in Firner would result in an unstable awkward position and therefore is not suitable for a stretcher. This argument is not found to commensurate with the scope of the claims since the stretcher is not claimed as laying flat. On Page 7 Lines 12-14 applicant agues that two adjacent passengers seats could not fit within the cabin of Firner along with a stretcher. This argument is not seen to be commensurate with the scope of the claims since the seats are not claimed to be side-by-side. ON page 7 Line 20 through page 8 Line 8 applicant argues that designing the light weight airplane does not simply involve substituting lighter materials. This argument is not commensurate with the scope of the claims since the non-conventional design which results in a lightweight aircraft has not been claimed.